



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,999	04/07/2006	Leslie Raymond Bates	06-224	3523
20306	7590	08/08/2011	EXAMINER	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP			PARSLEY, DAVID J	
300 S. WACKER DRIVE				
32ND FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60606			3643	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/08/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,999	BATES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID PARSLEY	3643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2011.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-18,20-27,29,30,45 and 46 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-18,20-27,29,30,45 and 46 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 April 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5-18-11 has been entered.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code as seen in page 2 line 30. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is essentially the same as claim 1. Appropriate correction is required. It is noted that correcting this informality may require changing the dependency of claims 23 and 25-27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 13, 20-27, 29-30 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,766,813 to Winter et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0020397 to Nielson et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0255812 to Bourne et al.

Referring to claims 1, 29 and 46, Winter et al. discloses a reactive shaped charge perforator comprising a liner and an associated shaped charge whereby the liner comprising a stoichiometric composition of two metals whereby the liner is capable in operation of an exothermic reaction upon activation of an associated shaped charge and in which the two metals are provided in respective proportions calculated to give an electron concentration of 1.5 - see figure 1 and column 3 lines 20-45. Winter et al. further discloses the composition is a pressed particulate composition - see column 3 lines 20-45. Winter et al. further discloses the composition of the at least two metals further comprises at least one further inert metal, wherein the at least one further metal is not capable of exothermic reaction upon activation of the shaped charge liner - see column 3 lines 20-45 of Winter et al. Winter et al. does not disclose a compacted particulate composition formed from a powder mixture of the at least two metal elements that will undergo an intermetallic alloying reaction. Nielson et al. discloses a shaped

charge liner made of a compacted particulate composition formed from a powder mixture of the at least two metal elements that will undergo an intermetallic alloying reaction and an inert metal not capable of exothermic reaction - see paragraphs [0030] thru [0033]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. and add the compacted particulate composition of two metals of Nielson et al., so as to allow for the liner to be made into a single layer comprising multiple materials. Specific to claim 46, Nielson et al. discloses using oxidizing agents other than fluoropolymers such as fluroelastomers. Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. does not disclose the liner is a green compacted particulate composition. Bourne et al. does disclose a liner of green compacted particulate composition - see paragraphs [0016] and [0026]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nelson et al. and add the green compacted liner composition of Bourne et al., so as to allow for the device to be easier to manufacture while allowing for the liner to be durable.

Referring to claim 2, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. further discloses one of the metals is aluminum – see column 3 lines 20-45 of Winter et al.

Referring to claim 3, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. further discloses one of the metals is selected from nickel and palladium - see column 3 lines 20-45 of Winter et al.

Referring to claim 13, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. further discloses the composition of the at least two metals is particulate with the particles having a diameter of 10 microns or less - see column 4 lines 50-66 of Winter et al.

Referring to claim 20, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. further discloses the at least one further metal is selected from copper, tungsten or an alloy thereof – see column 3 lines 20- 45 of Winter et al.

Referring to claim 21, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. further discloses the device of claim 1 as a shaped charge perforator - see figure 1 of Winter et al.

Referring to claim 22, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. further discloses a housing – at 12, a quantity of high explosive - at 14, located within the housing - see figure 1 of Winter et al., and a liner - at 18,30-34, of claim 1, located within the housing - see figure 1 of Winter et al., so that the high explosive is positioned between the liner and the housing - see figure 1 of Winter et al.

Referring to claims 23-27, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. as modified by Jacoby et al. further discloses one or more shaped charges of claims 1 and 21. Winter et al. does not specifically disclose a perforator gun, but Winter et al. does disclose using shaped charges in a well boring application as seen in column 1 lines 10-25 and in a well boring application the use of shaped charges in a perforating gun is inherent in such an application.

Referring to claim 30, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Winter et al. as modified by Jacoby et al. further discloses one of the metals is iron, molybdenum, nickel or palladium – see column 3 lines 34-45 of Winter et al.

Claims 5-12 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,371,219 to Collins et al.

Referring to claims 5 and 6, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. does not disclose a binder is added and/or coated on one of the metals to aid consolidation. Collins et al. does disclose a binder is added and/or coated on one of the metals to aid consolidation – see column 2 lines 50-67 and column 3 lines 1-15. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. and add the binder of Collins et al., so as to allow for the metal particles to be securely held together during use.

Referring to claims 7 and 45, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. further discloses the binder is a polymer - see column 2 lines 50-67 of Collins et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. and add the binder of Collins et al., so as to allow for the metal particles to be securely held together during use.

Referring to claim 8, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. does not specifically disclose the polymer is a stearate, wax or epoxy resin. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. and add the polymer binder being a stearate, wax or epoxy resin, so as to allow for the metal particles to be securely held together during use.

Referring to claim 9, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. further discloses the polymer is an energetic polymer – see column 2 lines 50-67 and column 3 lines 1-15 of Collins et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al., so as to allow for the metal particles to be securely held together during use.

Referring to claim 10, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. does not specifically disclose the energetic binder is selected from Polyglyn, GAP or Polynimmo. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. and add the energetic binder being Polyglyn, GAP or Polynimmo, so as to allow for the device to be more destructive during use.

Referring to claim 11, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. does not specifically disclose the binder is selected from lithium stearate or zinc stearate. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. and add the binder being lithium stearate or zinc stearate, so as to allow for the metal particles to be securely held together during use.

Referring to claim 12, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. does not specifically disclose the binder is present in the range of 0.1 to 5% by mass. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al., Bourne et al. and Collins et al. and add the binder being 0.1 to 5% by mass, so as to ensure that there is sufficient binder to hold the metal particles in place during use.

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. as applied to claim 13 above.

Referring to claims 14 and 15, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. further discloses the composition has particles being 1 micron or less in diameter or .1 microns or less in diameter – see paragraphs [0013] thru [0015] of Bourne et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. and add the particles being 1 or 0.1 microns or less of Bourne et al., so as to allow for the particles to be easier to shape into the desired final product during manufacturing.

Referring to claims 16 and 17, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. does not specifically disclose the thickness of the liner is in the range of 1 to 10% or 1 to 5% the liner diameter. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. and add the thickness of the liner being in the range of 1 to 10% or 1 to 5% the liner diameter, so as to allow for the device to be of sufficient size to be destructive during use.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,235,005 to Delacour.

Referring to claim 18, Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al. does not disclose the thickness of the liner is non-uniform across the surface area of the liner. Delacour does disclose the thickness of the liner is non-uniform across the surface area of the liner - see at 7 or 13 in figures 4 and 6. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Winter et al. as modified by Nielson et al. and Bourne et al.

and add the non-uniform thickness of the liner of Delacour, so as to allow for the device to be more destructive during use.

Response to Arguments

5. Regarding the prior art rejections of claims 1 and 46, the Nielson et al. reference US 2004/0020397 discloses a liner having a compacted particular composition formed from a powder mixture of at least two metal elements - see paragraph [0030] whereby the liner is reactive such that the at least two metals will undergo an intermetallic alloying reaction – see paragraphs [0030] thru [0033]. Applicant argues that the device of Nielson et al. is not used for wellbore operations and requires the use of a fluoropolymer oxidizing agent. Nevertheless, Nielson et al. discloses a shaped charge explosive device similar to shaped charge devices used in wellbore applications such as those of the Winter et al. reference US 4766813 and further the use of an oxidizing agent in Nielson et al. does not prohibit Nielson et al. from disclosing the claimed invention in that applicant does not discuss oxidizing agents in claim 1 and with respect to claim 46 as discussed above in paragraph 4 of this office action Nielson et al. discloses other oxidizing agents such as fluroelastomers not prohibited by claim 46. Further, the newly cited reference to Bourne et al. US 2004/0255812 discloses the use of green compacted powder mixture to form a shaped charge liner as discussed above in paragraph 4 of this office action. Further, it is well known in that art to use green compaction or sintering to form shaped charge liners and it would have been obvious to make the simple substitution of one method of forming

shaped charge liners with the other see paragraphs [0015] thru [0028] of Bourne et al. discussing both green compaction and sintering to form shaped charge liners.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID PARSLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-6890.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on (571) 272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David J Parsley/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643